

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested. The independent Claim 1 is amended for further distinguishing the present invention from the cited references. All of the amendments can be supported by the drawings and specification of the present invention, and therefore there is no new matter added therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

As recited in the amended Claim 1 of the present application, the present invention discloses a heat-dissipating fan module of an electronic apparatus, comprising:

*a casing having an opening, said opening having an airflow guiding device formed integrally therewith and along an edge thereof, wherein material that is removed to form said opening forms the guiding device by bending the material; and
a heat-dissipating fan fixed into one side of said casing and correspondingly disposed on said opening.*

None of the references cited in the Official Action discloses or suggest a fan module having a guiding device, as claimed, that is formed integrally with the opening of the casing, so that the guiding device is formed by material removed to form the opening of the casing.

A more detailed discussion of each of the rejections follows.

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckner (US 4,517,880)

Buckner discloses a fan mounting assembly for a video display terminal. The fan mounting assembly 10 is made from flexible molded plastic and is attached through an aperture in a rigid wall of a chassis 11 of the video display terminal by a plurality of retaining ears 12 and latches 13. The fan mounting assembly 10 is shaped as an open box with four sides 14, 15, 16, 17 and a front side 18, and a fan motor 21 is mounted on the fan mounting assembly 10 by resilient retaining fingers 22.

In the Office Action, the Examiner regards the structures with the reference numerals of 16 and 17 as the guiding device of the present invention, i.e. the Examiner considers the fan mounting assembly 10 of Buckner's patent equals to the guiding device of the present invention. However, It is clear that the fan mounting assembly 10 of Buckner's patent is not formed integrally with the aperture of the chassis 11, since it is attached to the chassis 11 via the retaining ears 12 and latches 13. In the present invention, the guiding device is formed integrally with the opening of the casing, which has the advantage that the metal material of the opening which is originally designed to be removed can be kept to form the guiding device by bending the metal material, so as to reduce the production cost (as described in paragraph [0032] of the specification). Therefore, the present invention is distinct from and cannot be taught or suggested by Buckner's patent.

While it is true that, in appropriate circumstances, a single prior art reference can render a claim obvious, there must be a showing of a suggestion or a motivation to modify the teachings of that reference to the claimed invention in order to support the obviousness conclusion. *B.F. Goodrich Co. v. Aircraft Breaking Sys. Corp.*, 72 F.3d 1577, 1582, 37 USPQ2d 1314, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1996). In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects the independent Claim 1 of the present invention based on a single prior art reference of Buckner (US 4,517,880). However, there is no showing of a suggestion or a motivation to modify the teachings of Buckner's patent in order to form the guiding device integrally with the opening of the casing, using the material originally designed to be removed in order to reduce the production cost. Buckner's guiding device instead requires the *addition* of material and therefore adds to, rather than subtracts from, the production cost. Therefore, Buckner's patent cannot render the claimed invention obvious, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-18 in view of the Buckner patent is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clements (US 5,707,282)

Clements discloses a cooling system for an electronic component. The cooling system includes a case 10 having a first wall section 22, and a grill 38,

40 having openings 42 is formed in the first wall section 22. A diffuser 80 is located within the case 10, and includes a first end portion 82 adapted to engage the air movement device 240 via a plurality of clips, and a second end portion 84 adapted to engage the wall section 22 of the case 10 via a diffuser hinge mechanism.

In the Office Action, the Examiner regards the structure with the reference numeral of 80 as the guiding device of the present invention, i.e. the Examiner considers the diffuser 80 of Clements' patent equals to the guiding device of the present invention. However, it is clear that the diffuser 80 of Clements' patent is not formed integrally with the openings 42 of the grill 38, 40 on the wall section 22 of the case 10, since it is attached to the case 10 via the diffuser hinge mechanism. In the present invention as noted above, the guiding device is formed integrally with the opening of the casing, and is characterized that *the metal material of the opening which is originally designed to be removed can be kept to form the guiding device by bending the metal material, so as to reduce the production cost* (as described in paragraph [0032] of the specification). Therefore, the present invention is distinct from and cannot be taught or suggested by Clements' patent.

Again, there is no showing in the Clements patent or elsewhere of a suggestion or a motivation to modify the teachings of Clements' patent to the claimed invention for forming the guiding device integrally with the opening of the casing, using the material originally designed to be removed in order to reduce the production cost. Therefore, the Clements' patent cannot render the claimed invention obvious.

In conclusion, none of the above cited references discloses the guiding device formed **integrally** with the opening of the casing ***using material removed to form the opening***, as recited in the amended independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited by the Examiner, or any combination thereof, render the amended Claim 1 obvious.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: March 3, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

HWB 5/1/2005 10:00 AM A:\JAMES\030305\03030501.rtf